

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ALEXIOS ALEXANDER,

Plaintiff,

No. 2:12-cv-0445 WBS EFB P

vs.

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF
CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION,
et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER


Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding without counsel in an action brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. He once again requests that the court appoint counsel.

As was previously explained to plaintiff, district courts lack authority to require counsel to represent indigent prisoners in section 1983 cases. *Mallard v. United States Dist. Court*, 490 U.S. 296, 298 (1989). In exceptional circumstances, the court may request an attorney to voluntarily to represent such a plaintiff. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1); *Terrell v. Brewer*, 935 F.2d 1015, 1017 (9th Cir. 1991); *Wood v. Housewright*, 900 F.2d 1332, 1335-36 (9th Cir. 1990). When determining whether “exceptional circumstances” exist, the court must consider the likelihood of success on the merits as well as the ability of the plaintiff to articulate his claims pro se in light of the complexity of the legal issues involved. *Palmer v. Valdez*, 560 F.3d 965,

1 970 (9th Cir. 2009). Having considered those factors, the court finds there are still no
2 exceptional circumstances in this case.

3 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's renewed request for
4 appointment of counsel, Dckt. No. 21, is denied.

5 DATED: August 27, 2012.

6 
7 EDMUND F. BRENNAN
8 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26